

In all respects but one my bill is identical to H.R. 10761 which was introduced on June 12, 1967, by Chairman McMillan. The difference between the two bills is the result of a problem that was brought to my attention by a member of the White House Police force who is a constituent. In effect, the problem is that the 1966 amendment to the public salary schedule placed all police privates with 19 years of service in longevity at lower pay.

In order to correct this inequity, I have offered a slightly different salary scale in H.R. 11435. What I have done is to eliminate Subclass (c) under Class 4 and to combine Subclass (a) and (b) under Class 4, thus giving fire sergeant, police sergeant and detective sergeant the same pay under a new Subclass (a), Class 4, and to continue the separate classification of "police sergeant assigned as motorcycle officer," but as Subclass (b) of Class 4 at the same proposed salary.

In working out this solution to the inequity I corresponded with Chief Layton who suggested that in effect I increase all rates for Class 4, Subclass (a) sergeant so that the maximum rate for private would not exceed the minimum rate for sergeant. Under my bill, H.R. 11435, the maximum rate for private is \$9,780 and the minimum rate for sergeant is \$10,285. This was accomplished by combining Subclasses (a) and (b) Class 4 into a single subclass and by applying the present rates for detective sergeants to both grades.

According to a letter of July 14, 1967, from Chief Layton, this change in my bill "would not only eliminate any possible inequity between the rates for sergeants and privates, but would also accomplish the goal of this department to eliminate the existing, unjustified separation of salary rates between police sergeants and detective sergeants." Mr. Chairman, the entire text of Chief Layton's letter is attached to my testimony and I request that it be included in the record of the hearing.

Mr. Chairman, on the overall question of increasing the salaries for these dedicated public servants, I believe that this legislation is entirely justified and badly-needed. Certainly the Congress is trying to do everything in its power to strengthen the front lines against crime and we must have the forces, and they must be equitably compensated, in order to conquer crime in the District.

By the time the 90th Congress finally closes its doors later this year it is my hope that we will have enacted a comprehensive package of anti-crime legislation not only for the District but the nation as well. The administration has pointed to many proposed programs for the District as "models." There is no reason why the District cannot be a model community in peace and tranquility and in the guarantee that every citizen can move about as he pleases in complete safety in mind and body. The Omnibus District Anti-Crime Act is a definite step in this direction. So will be the enactment of this legislation to provide equitable salaries for our policemen and firemen who daily defend our rights against criminals and violence.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge that this distinguished Committee give a favorable report to this legislation with a view toward early passage in the second session of the 90th Congress.